

3 Theoretical contours of contemporary fsw research

The purpose of this chapter is to introduce important theoretical building blocks available on fsw and to illustrate the fragmented state of current theory development. The sections are concerned with various aspects of fsw, such as 1) spiritual practice(s) and work, 2) different levels of analyzing fsw, 3) fsw and the ‘workplace-related concepts’ of leadership, management, and entrepreneurship, and 4) assessments of fsw (focusing on outcomes, justification, ethics, and critique of fsw).

In the following, I will consider both empirically¹ and conceptually oriented texts in their theory-related functions.² In the fifth section of this chapter, I will evaluate the contribution of the available theory to the two problem areas identified in chapter two (see 2.2.2 and 2.2.5) of the vagueness/abstraction/confusion of fsw terms (3.5.1) and the relation of fsw terms to the study of Christians at work (3.5.3). Furthermore, I will identify the use of workplace-related concepts (such as management, work, business, leadership, etc.) as an additional terminological challenge to fsw research (3.5.2).

3.1 Theorizing spiritual practice in work contexts

One promising avenue via which to remedy the abstraction problem of fsw appears to be the exploration of the link between fsw and concrete practices. If one looks at the attempts to define spirituality in work contexts discussed so far, the notion of (spiritual) practice/s seems not to be viewed as part of the concept of spirituality itself; instead, spirituality is construed as being characterized by certain aspects or dimensions, such as Ashmos and Duchon’s (2000) three dimensions of spirituality at work (inner life, meaningful work, and community). According to Hudson (2014:30–33), much research literature seems to treat spirituality at work as a state of

1 In the case of empirically oriented articles, it is mostly that of theory testing, and sometimes, but to a lesser degree, that of theory generation.

2 In this theoretically orientated overview of fsw research, I do not engage in detail with historical accounts of fsw (see e.g. Benefiel, Fry & Geigle 2014, Davenport 2008, Lambert 2009, Miller 2007, 2003, Steensen & Villadsen 2019), or with fsw in relation to particular work contexts, professions, and types of work (see chapter 1.1 for a list of some examples of the literature in these respects), apart from management, leadership, and entrepreneurship (and with respect to these three terms, it is not clear whether they refer to ‘types of work’ or constitute a ‘profession’, see below).

mind, and the relationship between one's "acts" and spirituality is not clear. Others have indicated that spiritual practices seem to be crucial for fsw because they are "portable and adaptable" (Grant, O'Neil & Stephens 2004:268), and thus allow spirituality to retain its salience outside organized religion. With respect to the inclusion of spiritual practice at work, Grant and colleagues (2004) mention a number of aspects which play a role. First, it is crucial whether individuals can *interpret* their work practices and their companies' operations in sacred terms (2004:268). In addition, Grant and colleagues (2004:281) suggest that variations in *opportunity structures* for spiritual practices across different working contexts, and variations of experiences of spirituality (engaging and disengaging) should be considered in further research. Given the potentially important role spiritual practice seems to play, how are the notions of spiritual practice/s and spirituality in the workplace related?

3.1.1 *Spiritual practices and workplace spirituality*

The relationship between spiritual practices and workplace spirituality is addressed by two publications which examine the influence of meditation practices on levels of spirituality in organizations. Petchsawang and Duchon (2012) find that individuals who practice meditation have higher scores in workplace spirituality than those who do not. Petchsawang and McLean (2017) compare organizations that offer mindfulness meditation courses to organizations that do not and find that the levels of workplace spirituality and work engagement are higher in those organizations that do offer mindfulness meditation courses.³

In addition to this observation of a positive effect of spiritual practice upon levels of spirituality in an organization,⁴ spiritual practice is explored as a coping strategy to mitigate adverse influences of work contexts, such as stress and negative emotions. Studying prayer in organizational life in Brazil, Vasconcelos (2010) finds that the subjects studied view prayer as a form of communication with a divine power and regarded prayer as beneficial in "deal[ing] with tasks, colleagues' relationships, negative emotions and spiritual vibrations at work settings" (2010:369). Goltz (2011) reviews the

3 This seems to be consistent with Fry and Cohen's (2009:80) conceptualization of the relationship, where they identify spiritual practice as the source of spiritual well-being in an organization (on Fry and Cohen's approach to spiritual leadership, see 3.3).

4 Which some might argue is tautological, and if one were NOT to find empirical evidence of this relationship, something would have gone remarkably wrong with one's research.

literature on the effects of spiritual practices and finds that prayer and meditation have significant positive effects on an individual's physiological and emotional state and result in beneficial changes in cognition (2011:345), and that spiritual practices may lead to non-judgmental awareness, calmness, empathy, and flexibility. Arnetz and colleagues (2013:271) study the relationship of spiritual values and practices to employee stress and mental well-being. Their results indicate that spiritual values are positively associated with mental well-being and low occupational stress, and that spiritual practices are positively associated with low work-related exhaustion.⁵

But what is spiritual practice? The study of spiritual practices seems to focus mainly on prayer and meditation⁶, with few exceptions, for example the study by Kluver and Wicks (2014:358) on “decorative practices” as a form of spiritual expression. While individual spiritual practices in organizations are addressed by a number of researchers, the study of *corporate* spiritual practices seems less prominent. One exception is presented by Dyck and Wong (2010, see also 3.4.1), who draw on the literature on spiritual disciplines (Dallas Willard and Richard Foster) to propose the practice of the four corporate spiritual disciplines of confession, worship, guidance, and celebration.⁷ In our own research (Brügger 2018; Brügger & Huppenbauer 2019), a few managers reported the practice of *corporate* spiritual activities at work.⁸ While the texts discussed in this subsection propose the integration of spiritual practices, which are mostly viewed as not being directly associated with work contexts in the first place, others have suggested that work itself is to be understood as being inherently spiritual.

5 While this passage addresses the effects of spiritual practice at work, the broader topic of outcomes of fsw will be addressed in 3.4.

6 In addition to spirituality, the study of meditation at work is related to other concepts like consciousness (e.g. Marques 2010), mindfulness (see e.g. Badham & King 2019, Dane 2011, Kalafatoğlu & Turgut 2019, Van Dam et al. 2018, Weick & Putnam 2006) and conscious awareness (Pavlovich 2010).

7 See also Delbecq's (2010) study on organizational-level spirituality, which does not focus particularly on spiritual practices, but which also takes account of the modes of behavior that are related to the manifestation of spirituality (see 3.2.1).

8 Such as collective prayer and corporate events, including such activities as body awareness exercises, dialog, and reflection.

3.1.2 *Work as spiritual practice*

The argument is put forward in different ways (from a historical, neurological, conceptual, or practical perspective). Arguing from a historical perspective, Ottaway (2003) points out that an understanding of work as spiritual can be found throughout history, for example in the Hebrew Bible, the New Testament writings, the thinking of the early Church Fathers, the Protestant ethic, and also in the writings of modern theological writers on the spirituality of work (he discusses the work of Holland, Fox, Volf and Occhiogrosso). Peregoy (2016) explores the idea that work itself is spiritual. He proposes a ‘spirituality of work’, instead of a ‘spirituality at work’, and finds that the idea of work as spiritual appears in Catholic and Protestant thinking, in Islam, in Judaism, and in a number of secular writers (i.e. Maslow, Palmer, Wilber, Newberg & Waldman). Peregoy concludes that, for the individual, practicing work as something spiritual requires a certain “oneness” (2016) and the alignment of one’s thoughts, actions, and emotions.

From a neurological perspective, Smith (2008) argues that spiritual experience is facilitated by ritualized activities and repetitive behavior, which can be found in religious practices *as well as* at work (2008:17–21). In this view, spirituality is not something which is *added* to a particular work activity, but work itself can be experienced as something spiritual: “If spiritual experiences and peak work experiences can share a common neurological agency, then work might itself be considered a legitimate site for spiritual experiences” (2008:23) (see also 3.2.2).

Arguing on conceptual grounds, Long and Driscoll (2015) first observe that in the workplace spirituality discourse, authors make connections between spiritual concepts and work. They go on to concede that the story can be told differently in that “it could be argued that the authors of the texts we analyzed are not making any new discursive connections between spiritual concepts and work for they may be implicitly linked from the start” (2015:951). Such a conceptual connection between work and spirituality is also posited by Vivan Ligo (2011:441). She suggests that the concept of work is to be understood in terms of five variables (product, process, end user, the worker, and the workplace). As each of these five variables entails a spiritual dimension, the spirituality of work is part of (the concept of) work itself.⁹

9 For a more detailed discussion of Ligo’s (2011) approach, see 4.3.

Exploring the practical integration of spiritual practice at work, Lychnell (2017) describes a process whereby the work of the managers he studied becomes spiritual. In Lychnell's study, this process is initiated and sustained by the manager's meditation practice. The managers gradually learn to apply a meditative attitude to their work situations. They increasingly expand the meditative attitude acquired during their meditation practice to the work setting. In this way, their "work becomes meditation" (2017). This process results in a "holistic understanding" (2017) of oneself and one's situations because it is based on embodied experience, including thoughts, feelings, and physical sensations. In this way, the spiritual practice (which has a distinct place and time separate from one's work) results in an attitude which gradually expands and develops into a stable disposition, in which a manager's experience (including the work experience) becomes rooted. In such a perspective, while work is not construed as inherently spiritual from the beginning, spirituality as a 'meditative attitude' is conceptualized as being able to encompass and 'spiritualize' one's experience of work.

Additionally, the implicit connections between work and spirituality have been addressed by a number of other authors: for example, Radzins (2011) explores the spiritual nature of work in the thinking of Simone Weil.¹⁰ Others have explored the way in which management practices require faith (Olohan & Davitti 2017), and the parallels between trust (in organizational contexts) and faith (within a religious framework) (Caldwell, Davis and Devine 2009). Black (2011:6) has even argued that management, rightly understood, consists of spiritual exercises (in contrast to pious rituals or managerial techniques), and that "searching for God" is an inherent part of corporate existence.¹¹ In Fry's (see e.g. Fry & Cohen 2009) theory of spiritual leadership, the source of spiritual leadership is 'inner life' or spiritual practice, which may include individual practices, such as meditation, prayer, yoga, journaling or walking in nature, and organizational spaces, such as rooms for silence and reflection.¹²

In sum, the notion of spiritual practice/s is portrayed by some scholars as distinct from but related to work (or management, or leadership), while others conceptualize spiritual practice in a comprehensive way, in which the notion allows an interpretation of work (or management, or leadership) itself as a spiritual practice. Research on spiritual practice in work contexts is also related to other important theoretical building blocks of fsw, such as

10 For a more detailed discussion of Radzins' (2017) approach, see 4.3.

11 For a discussion of Black's (2011, 2009, 2008) approach, see 5.4.

12 On the spiritual leadership theory, see 3.3.

the outcomes of fsw (see 3.4), and the different levels of analysis of fsw (3.2), to which I will turn now.

3.2 Fsw levels of analysis

One way to categorize fsw publications is according to the level they primarily address. The most often used distinction is that between the organizational (meso) and the individual (micro) levels, although some publications also explicitly cover the macro level of the broader cultural and social context (see e.g. Dodd & Gotsis 2007) or issues located between the meso and micro levels, that is, on the unit or team level (e.g. Benefiel, Fry & Geigle 2014:182). In the following, I will first address the organizational and subsequently the individual levels, before turning to the question of the interrelationships between the different levels.

3.2.1 *Organizational-level fsw*

In this section, I will briefly introduce research focusing on the organizational level. First, I will address the manifestation of spirituality on an organizational level, and second, organizational attitudes toward fsw. Some authors conceptualize and explore the *manifestation* of spirituality in work contexts as a cultural expression of certain values. Jurkiewicz and Giacalone (2004) develop a values framework of workplace spirituality¹³. In their approach, ‘workplace spirituality’ is by definition an organizational variable. It refers to an organizational culture which is marked by the values of benevolence, generativity, humanism, integrity, justice, mutuality, receptivity, respect, responsibility, and trust. In a similar vein, Delbecq (2010) presents a case study of how spirituality is manifested in the corporate culture of a particular health care organization. These are the lived values he identified (2010:69): mission centric, vocational/calling emphasis, inclusive decision-making, differential talents valued, respectful interactions, connection to transcendence through prayer/reflection, attention to mission in selection, investment in development, behavioral modeling by leaders. In such a conceptualization of fsw as being characterized by values, fsw is not understood as being constituted by certain practices or behavior, but by certain dispositions or attitudes which orient organizational behavior. Compared to

13 Which they propose as the basis for the empirical testing of the relationship of workplace spirituality and organizational performance. For a discussion of their definition of workplace spirituality, see 2.2.

other approaches, spirituality is understood more narrowly here as pertaining to normative orientations (such as values), while other aspects, such as spiritual practices and organizational contexts, seem to be less important.¹⁴

This broader context, on which the manifestation of fsw relies, is indicated by studies which address the theme of organizational implementation or facilitation of fsw (e.g. Houghton, Neck and Krishnakumar 2016, Miller & Ngunjiri 2014, Pawar 2009, Bandsuch & Cavanagh 2005). While Houghton and colleagues (2016) and Miller and Ngunjiri (2014) focus on particular aspects of fsw facilitation (leadership and workplace chaplains¹⁵ respectively), Pawar (2009:382) offers a comprehensive model of factors that facilitate fsw. His model explicitly considers a variety of factors (e.g. leadership development, leadership practice, organizational spiritual values, personal spiritual values and practices, and individual and group focused activities to facilitate workplace spirituality) and locates them within a broader framework which culminates in the experience of workplace spirituality.¹⁶

A particular aspect which also occurs in Pawar's model, and which attracts some research, is the question of the *attitude* taken by organizations and their managers toward the expression of faith or spirituality at work. A number of authors have proposed a typology of organizations according to the attitude they take toward fsw. Mitroff and Denton (1999a, 1999b) identify six organizational designs in terms of workplace spirituality: religion-based organization, evolutionary organization, recovering organization, socially responsible organization, values-based organization, and a hybrid-type organization.¹⁷ Giacalone and Jurkiewicz (2003) suggest three types of relationship between spirituality and the workplace: the parallel relationship, the adversarial relationship, and the integrative relationship. Pinha e Cunha, Rego, and D'Oliveira (2006) propose a typology of organization and management theories in terms of organizational spiritualities, distinguishing between the dominant view of people (as independent or dependent) and the model of management (as spiritually informed or spiritually uninformed). This approach results in four types of organization: the soulful

14 As the individual fsw section will make clear, particular forms of *experience* can be considered another crucial aspect of fsw.

15 For a literature review on workplace chaplaincy, see Wolf and Feldbauer-Durstmüller (2018).

16 For an alternative model focusing on rituals, community, and belief, see Bandsuch and Cavanagh (2005:228).

17 For a discussion, see Miller and Ewest (2013a:38f).

organization (view of people as dependent, spiritually informed management practice), the ascetic organization (dependent people, management as a spiritually uninformed practice), the holistic organization (independent people, spiritually informed management), and the professional organization (independent people, spiritually uninformed management practice). Moreover, Ashfort and Pratt (2010) propose three types of organization with regard to workplace spirituality on a matrix around individual and organizational control: enabling organizations (high individual and low organizational control), directing organizations (low individual and high organizational control) and partnering organizations (high individual and high organizational control). Miller and Ewest (2015) propose the “faith and work organizational framework”, which focuses on corporate actions and attitudes toward workplace spirituality and religion. It identifies four distinct organizational approaches, namely faith-avoiding, faith-based, faith-safe, and faith-friendly organizations (2015:1). Ibrahim and Angelidis (2005) suggest differentiating between explicitly Christian and secular companies.

The variety of proposed typologies indicates a diversity of possible approaches which organizations and their managers can take toward fsw. The question which arises here is that of the criteria (and their appropriateness) which guide organizations in developing an attitude toward fsw. This question will be addressed in more detail in section 3.4. Having offered a brief overview of existing research on organizational fsw in this section, I will now turn to individual-level fsw.

3.2.2 Individual fsw

Different conceptions of individual fsw emerge around different answers to the question of what is essential to or at the core of individual-level fsw. The four main answers I am going to address here are experience (Heaton, Schmidt-Wilk & Travis 2004, Smith 2008), the intention to integrate (Miller 2013b), worldview assumptions (Daniels, Franz & Wong 2000), and spiritual practice (Fry & Cohen 2009), resulting in an emphasis on what I characterize as an experiential, volitional/intentional, cognitive/intellectual or practical account of fsw.

First, with regard to what I refer to as an experiential understanding, Heaton and colleagues (2004) propose a conceptualization of spirituality in organizations consisting of the three related concepts of “pure spirituality”, “applied spirituality”, and “spiritual development.” Pure spirituality refers to the “silent, unbounded, inner experience of pure self-awareness, devoid of

customary content of perception, thoughts, and feelings” (2004:63). Applied spirituality refers to “the domain of practical applications and measurable outcomes that automatically arise from the inner experience of pure spirituality” (2004:64). Spiritual development means the “holistic process of positive transformation through experience of pure spirituality (...) the process through which all aspects of the personality grow from experiences of pure spirituality” (2004:64). Thus, the experience of pure spirituality affects a person on all levels of existence (such as emotions, intellect, mind, sense perception, and behavior) and the outcomes of such experiences are referred to as “applied spirituality”, while the development of these outcomes and their integration into the life of an individual are called “spiritual development”.¹⁸

This differentiation between an essential spiritual experience and its application is taken up by Smith (2008).¹⁹ He proposes a theoretical framework of organizational spirituality which draws upon practitioner reports, as well as existing academic theory, and incorporates them into a comprehensive map (see Smith 2008:20). At the core of his conceptualization is what Smiths terms the “spiritual experience”, drawing on Heaton and colleagues’ (2004) concept of pure spirituality, which refers to “direct personal experience”, as opposed to applied spirituality, which denotes the outcomes and consequences of spiritual experience. The individual spiritual experience differs in terms of two main continua: intensity (mild or intense) and duration (transient or permanent) (2008:9). Smith focuses on transient spiritual experience, which is associated with “the perception of an absence of time, space, and body, as well as feelings of peacefulness, unboundedness and fullness of life” (2008:6). It carries measurable emotional, physiological, and neurological correlates (2008:6).

- 18 Although the conception is presented in general terms, Heaton and colleagues focus primarily on the study of transcendental meditation, and their understanding of pure spirituality is drawn from the writings of the Vedic scholar and teacher Maharishi Mahesh Yogi (see Heaton et. al. 2004:64).
- 19 The distinction between pure and applied spirituality used by Smith also resembles Wozniak’s (2012) distinction between spirituality and religion (see 2.2). While Wozniak does not directly refer to spirituality as an experience, she (drawing on the thinking of Simmel) conceives of spirituality as a state or quality of the form of being of people. This quality may then be accompanied by such aspects as practices, systems of beliefs and morals, attitudes, and values. These aspects can be referred to as ‘religion’ as a social form and they “emerge as materializations of the spiritual impulses of human beings” (2012:34).

Drawing on a classification of definitions of spirituality by Krishnakumar and Neck (2002), Smith (2008) argues that there are three main types of understanding of the origin of spirituality: the intrinsic-origin view, the extrinsic-origin²⁰ view and the existential-origin view. For Smith, however, the question of spirituality versus religion and that of the individual interpretation of the cause of a spiritual experience are of secondary importance. Instead he argues for the centrality of the experience of spiritual *states* in terms of pure spirituality, and proposes that people can experience spiritual states “*regardless of the way in which they or others define the origin of that experience*” (Smith 2008:7.15, my emphasis).

Smith refers to the level which Heaton and colleagues (2004) call applied spirituality as the area of manifestations of spirituality. He differentiates between an area of *inner* manifestations of spirituality, such as decision-making and thinking patterns, sensory awareness and intellectual frameworks of ethics and morality, and an area of *outer* manifestations of spirituality, such as behavior, health and (emotional) well-being, creative abilities, and interpersonal abilities and connections (2008:7).

In sum, Smith answers the question of *what* (individual²¹) spirituality at work is in a quite comprehensive manner.²² His answer entails four aspects. 1) The core element of organizational spirituality is the individual spiritual experience, 2) framed by the individual’s view of the origin of this spiritual experience. The spiritual experience is manifested in 3) an inner domain as inner qualities (virtues, values, frameworks, convictions, et cetera) and 4) in the outer domain of observable states, behavior, and actions. While Smith does not specify the inner and outer manifestations of spirituality in more detail as regards their content, he does so in terms of the spiritual experience and its emotional, physiological, and neurological correlates. The spiritual experience is characterized by the perception of an absence of space, time, and body, and accompanied by feelings of peace, joy, and unity.

20 This type is an adaption of Krishnakumar and Neck’s ‘religious view’.

21 Smith actually speaks of ‘organizational spirituality’, but I take him to be referring to the spirituality of individuals in organizational contexts.

22 It is to be noted that he focuses on transient spiritual experience, although *permanent* spiritual experience might be quite an important aspect of spirituality in the workplace as well. Aaron Smith indicated to me via e-mail (21 Sept 2015) that he has not yet pursued the issue further, but that in his opinion daily spiritual experience in the workplace remains an important and underdeveloped area of research. See also Benefiel (2003:384) who criticizes a superficial understanding of spirituality which focuses on peak spiritual experiences with which one is tempted to abandon the spiritual path as soon as one hits “the inevitable bumps on the spiritual journey”.

Smith is also quite precise in sketching the conditions of *how* spirituality and work can be integrated. 1) A spiritual experience can occur *regardless* of the way an individual defines the origin (e.g. God) of this experience. In this approach, spirituality at work can occur with or without an individual's commitment to particular traditional beliefs or interpretations. In this sense, traditional influences are of secondary importance for the emergence of spirituality in the workplace. 2) There is no on/off-button for spiritual experiences and "the right combination of conditions is probably quite rare" (2008:17). There are, however, two main facilitating factors for spiritual experiences: intense attention-focusing and ritualized, repetitive activity (2008: 6.19 – 21).

In this view, in terms of general lifestyle, it will be helpful for the blossoming of one's spirituality to become engaged in long-term repetitive behavior, such as prayer or meditation (Smith 2008: 21, see also Delbecq 2004). From a neurological perspective, this predisposes the brain for spiritual experiences. In terms of the individual's concrete experience of work, spiritual experiences are facilitated by engaging in attention-focusing tasks and by integrating repetitive, ritualized behavior at work. This does not need to be specifically faith-related, but any activity (also directly work-related ones) can be ritualized (Smith 2008:17). Because the neurological correlates of spiritual experience can also emerge during an intensely attention-focusing task, there is "in neurological terms, (...) little that separates work from religion in terms of stimulating the brain preconditions needed for spiritual episodes" (2008:17).²³

Second, in terms of what I refer to as a volitional or intentional account of individual fsw, David Miller and colleagues (2018, 2013b, 2007, 2003) propose an "integration box" theory of faith²⁴ at work. This theory is intended to be descriptive in that it offers a typology of four different, but equally legitimate styles of faith–work behavior. In this perspective, people integrate faith and work mainly in accordance with four primary modes (and corresponding motivations), which can be specified in more detail according to two different orientations for each mode: the Ethics type (with community- or self-orientation subtypes), the Expression (earlier called "evangelization", 2003:307) type (with verbal or nonverbal orientation), the Experience type (with outcomes or process/activity orientations), and the Enrichment type (with group or individual orientation). According to Miller and Ewest (2013b), everyone's faith–work integration can be described in

23 On the possibility of experiencing work spiritually, see also 3.1.2.

24 Which in this conception includes spirituality.

terms of these four types and specified according to the two orientations for each type.

All four types represent “behavioral manifestations and corresponding motivation” (2013b:406) of faith–work integration. This typology was developed drawing on Miller’s research on the faith at work movement and its historical development. Miller and Ewest (2013b:405) posit a “unifying principle of faith and work integration that drives the movement and its participants”. This “primary organizing principle” of the people in the movement is “a desire to live an integrated life where their spiritual identity was not divorced from their workplace life” (Miller & Ewest 2013b:405). The core driver of the people in the movement is thus a certain desire or intention. As regards content, Miller and Ewest stay intentionally broad. They use ‘faith’ as an umbrella term which, they argue, is able to encompass a broad range of religions, spiritualities, and worldviews (2013b:406). They thus seek to offer a theory of faith–work integration which is able to capture variety in terms of “multiple faith perspectives”, of the “multivariate nature of workplace spirituality” (2013b:405) and of the individual expression of one’s faith at work. Miller and Ewest argue that what unifies people who integrate their faith, spirituality, or religion with their work, is not specific content (e.g. in terms of participating in a particular tradition or of having a particular spiritual experience), but the desire to integrate one’s faith (whatever that faith may be) with one’s work. In other words, Miller and Ewest assume a more formal or modal core of faith at work/workplace spirituality which allows for diversity in terms of content.

Third, in terms of a cognitive/intellectual account of individual fsw, Daniels, Franz, and Wong (2000)²⁵ argue that one’s conception of spirituality is dependent on basic assumptions with regard to epistemology and ontology, that is, “worldview assumptions”. In this view, the influence of one’s spirituality on management practice and education differs in relation to the different conceptions of spirituality an individual holds, and these are determined by the underlying worldview. A worldview is a set of presuppositions that shapes how one perceives the world. Daniels, Franz, and Wong (2000) identify four main types of worldview based on different positions in relation to an ontological (the nature of reality) and epistemological (ways of knowing) continuum (2000).

The understanding of the nature of the spiritual is located on the (horizontal) ontological continuum: at the ‘material’ end, reality is understood to be limited to the material world, whereas at the ‘transcendent’ end, an

25 See also my discussion of their Christian approach to management in 5.4.2.

immaterial dimension or aspect of reality is assumed. From both perspectives, it is possible to speak of ‘spirit’, but the term refers to something totally different in each approach. Implied in the two positions are two different views of business: the purpose of business is to make profit (material perspective), or the purpose of business is to serve others, that is, customers and employees (transcendent perspective) (Daniels, Franz, and Wong 2000).

The understanding of how one experiences and knows the spiritual is located on the (vertical) epistemological continuum. At the objective end, it is assumed that there is an external referent to individual (spiritual as well as other forms of) experience, while at the subjective end, experience is conceived of as purely subjective. The combination of ontological and epistemological assumptions results in four main types of worldview: modern (material and objective orientation), postmodern (material and subjective orientation), mystic (transcendent and subjective orientation), and theistic (transcendent and objective orientation). Each of these worldviews implies a different understanding of the spiritual and spirituality, and entails a corresponding view of business and management. The framework thus serves as an “organizing scheme for articulating managerial implications of spirituality” (Daniels, Franz, and Wong 2000). In this approach, the cognitive content of one’s assumptions is assumed to be crucial for the formation of (individual) spirituality in the workplace.

Fourth, in terms of a practical account of individual fsw, Fry (see e.g. Fry & Cohen 2009) conceptualizes spiritual practice as central to a leader’s individual spirituality. The content of such a practice is not predefined: it may include individual practices, such as meditation, prayer, yoga, journaling, or walking in nature.

Four different answers to what the essential core of individual fsw is can thus be identified: experience (Heaton et al. 2004, Smith 2008), the intention to integrate (Miller 2013b), worldview assumptions (Daniels, Franz & Wong 2000), or spiritual practice (Fry & Cohen 2009). In summary, individual fsw is conceptualized as being either essentially experiential, volitional/intentional, cognitive/intellectual, or practical. Having introduced the main approaches to organizational and individual fsw, I will now turn to the question of interrelationships between levels.

3.2.3 *Interrelationship between the individual, organizational, and extra-organizational levels*

The two main questions that arise in this area of fsw research are the role of the organizational context in fostering or inhibiting the manifestation of (individual and organizational) fsw and the question of the facilitation of spirituality (individual and organizational) from an organizational perspective. I will first turn to the role of the organizational context in the manifestation of fsw. Weaver and Agle (2002) suggest that religious role expectations, internalized as religious self-identity, may influence ethical behavior at work, but that this effect is moderated by religious identity salience and religious motivational orientation. Religious identity salience is in turn influenced by the organizational context, which indicates the interrelatedness of one's religiosity, one's ethical behavior and the organizational context. In particular, they (2002:86–88) propose that the organizational context can influence the manifestation of one's religiosity, that is, “religious salience” at work. They argue that it is a simplistic view, which holds that the “values of economizing and power aggrandizing often found in business organizations completely overpower employees’ personal values” (2002:86) and that the process in which factors of the organizational context influence the salience of different elements of one's identity is complex. In a similar vein, Dodd and Gotsis (2007:102) argue that the relationship between religion and enterprise is highly context-specific. They suggest that it is mediated by political structures and ideologies and by religious symbolism in the workplace. Lynn, Naughton & VanderVeen (2010) find that faith–work integration (measured by the faith at work scale) is associated with two variables from inside the organizational context (negatively with organization size and positively with relationships with workplace mentors). It is positively associated with a number of extra-organizational context variables (such as faith maturity, church attendance, age, denominational strictness, and the practice of spiritual disciplines). Pawar (2014) studies the effects of a leader's individual spirituality and organizational spirituality on a leader's spiritual behavior toward subordinates. He finds that individual spirituality can account for variance in leaders' spiritual behavior toward subordinates, while organizational spirituality cannot. McGhee and Grant (2016:1) argue that one's spirituality manifested as an awareness of others that guides and enables authentic ethical action can enable someone to transcend organizational conditions. In summary, the studies available indicate that organizational context and fsw are interrelated in various ways.

A second question is how the manifestation of fsw can be facilitated from an organizational perspective.²⁶ In this regard, two publications emphasize the importance of a fit between individuals and organizational context. First, Singhal and Chatterjee (2006:173f) propose a person–organization fit approach as the basis for a conceptual framework of spirituality at work. They hypothesize that individual–organizational alignment is the key factor predictive of different outcomes of spirituality at work. Second, Kolodinsky, Giacalone, and Jurkiewicz (2008:467) argue that workplace spirituality can be conceptualized from three different perspectives: as an organizational variable, an individual variable or as a variable in terms of the interaction between an individual’s and an organization’s spirituality. Organizational spirituality is a variable of organizational culture. This organizational level spirituality interacts with a worker’s personal spirituality, that is, the incorporation of a person’s spiritual ideals and beliefs into the work context. The interaction of organizational and personal spirituality is related to “work rewards satisfaction” (2008:465). Kolodinsky, Giacalone, and Jurkiewicz (2008:467) argue for a person–environment fit approach and suggest that, in order to achieve positive work-related outcomes, the fit between one’s individual spirituality and one’s perception of organizational spirituality in terms of values congruence is crucial. In addition, Pawar (2009:382)²⁷ proposes a comprehensive model, based on a review of extant research, of how different levels are interrelated in facilitating workplace spirituality. Individual experiences of workplace spirituality can be fostered through individual-focused spiritual development of leaders, leadership with a focus on organizational spirituality, particular spirituality-enhancing organizational practices, the personal spiritual values and practices of a leader, individual-focused spiritual development of employees, and group-focused workplace spirituality facilitation (Pawar 2009).

In conclusion, while the particular contexts of fsw seem to be crucial, the level distinction between organizational and individual fsw is primarily used as an analytical move relevant for the observer and seems to be of limited value or of secondary importance in relation to fsw. Furthermore, it tends not to be viewed as part of the construct of fsw.²⁸ In reality, there is always

26 On the related question of organizational attitudes toward fsw, see section 3.2.1.

27 See also section 3.2.1 in the present chapter.

28 This also holds true for accounts that conceptualize workplace spirituality as an organizational variable, where it seems to be understood, by and large, as an accumulation of individual spiritualities.

both: individuals and a context (intra- and extra-organizational).²⁹ In such an analytically differentiated view, rather than relating to the phenomenon of fsw, the two levels pertain to two different levels of analysis of the same phenomenon and its effects. Thus, the research discussed here seems somehow to view organizational spirituality as *the sum of the accumulated individual spiritualities*. In the end, one could argue that there is no such thing as organizational spirituality if spirituality is not manifested in the life of the individuals who are part of an organization. What does not seem to come into consideration in such an approach to organizational spirituality, however, is the question of the ‘spiritual nature’ of organizations (see, however, Pfaltzgraff-Carlson 2020). In this regard, I will take up below (see 5.4) the proposal presented by Michael Black (2009), who argues that organizations, understood as corporations with a distinct identity, are spiritual entities that are conceptually closely tied to Christian tradition and can only be understood in theological terms. Having discussed different levels of fsw which can be seen as *formal* specifications of the ‘work contexts’ part of the phrase ‘faith, spirituality, and religion in work contexts’, I will now turn to discussing three concepts which can be seen as more *materially* oriented (content-related) specifications of the ‘work’ part of the phrase ‘faith, spirituality, and religion in work contexts’, and which are often used in research literature in relation to fsw: leadership, management, and entrepreneurship.

3.3 Fsw and selected work-related concepts

In this section, I will discuss fsw with regard to the notions of leadership, management/management education, and entrepreneurship because these three notions are prominent in fsw research. Studies that use these concepts do not address the relationship between faith, spirituality or religion, and work (or workplaces, work contexts) in general, but focus on particular constructs assumed to be important for fsw.

29 The interdependence of the different levels can also be observed in texts on legal implications of faith at work (e.g., Adams 2012; Miller & Ewest 2015:7–9; Sullivan 2013; Morgan 2016, 2005), where distinctions with respect to levels become secondary because legal issues are related to both the organizational and individual levels (and because they are concerned with law, they also relate to the macro- or extra-organizational level).

3.3.1 Fsw and leadership

Numerous researchers have addressed the relationship between spirituality and leadership³⁰ (e.g. Barney, Wicks, Scharmer & Pavlovich 2015, Benefiel 2005, Bugenhagen 2009, Fairholm 1996, Fairholm and Fairholm 2009, Fairholm and Gronau 2015, Fry & Cohen 2009, Grandy & Sliwa 2017, Lean & Ganster 2017, Low & Ayoko 2020, Naidoo 2014, Pruzan 2008, Reave 2005, Sanders, Hopkins and Geroy 2003, Tourish & Tourish 2010). While some have argued that spiritual leadership leads to positive individual and organizational outcomes (e.g. Fry & Cohen 2009, Reave 2005), others outline that the positive effects of spiritual leadership are mediated by certain boundary conditions (Krishnakumar et al. 2015) and raise basic questions concerning the very attempt to relate spirituality and leadership (Dent, Higgins & Wharff 2005), arguing that both concepts lack a widely accepted definition and that, therefore, relating the two concepts makes things even more vague and complicated.

The relationship between spirituality and leadership is explored in both directions of influence. Addressing the influence of leadership on spirituality, Houghton, Neck, and Krishnakumar (2016) suggest that a number of leadership styles may help to facilitate spirituality and spiritual diversity in the workplace, such as spiritual leadership, servant leadership, authentic leadership, ethical leadership, empowering leadership, self-leadership, and shared leadership. Addressing the influence of spirituality on leadership, Phipps (2012) explores the role of spiritual beliefs in decision-making and strategic leadership. He argues in particular that spiritual beliefs function as *schemata* to filter or frame the information which leaders consider.

Additionally, a number of models or comprehensive conceptions of spiritual leadership have been put forth.³¹ The causal spiritual leadership model was presented and revised by Louis Fry in various journal articles (Fry 2003, 2005, 2009, 2013, Fry & Cohen 2009, Fry & Matherly 2006, Fry & Slocum 2008, Fry, Vitucci & Cedillo 2005, Sweeney and Fry 2012), and tested and explored across various organizational and cultural contexts (e.g. Chaston & Lips-Wiersma 2015, Chen, Yang & Li 2012, Chen & Yang 2012, Chen & Li 2013, Jeon et al. 2013).³² Spiritual leadership, as conceptualized by Fry and colleagues, entails the two processes of:

30 On religion and leadership, see for example Gümüşay (2018) and the literature there.

31 See also the recent review of spiritual leadership research by Oh and Wang (2020).

32 For an overview of the theory development and testing, see Benefiel, Fry, and Geigle (2014:178–180).

1. Creating a (transcendent) vision (of service to others) wherein one experiences a sense of calling, in that life has meaning and makes a difference.
2. Establishing (or reinforcing) an organizational culture based on the values of altruistic love, whereby one has a sense of membership, feels understood and appreciated, and has genuine care, concern, and appreciation for both oneself and others (see Fry & Cohen 2009; Benefiel, Fry & Geigle 2014).

In terms of the leader's values, attitudes, and behavior, spiritual leadership is based on hope/faith in a transcendent vision of service to others and the values of altruistic love. The purpose of spiritual leadership is to create vision and value congruence across organizational, team, and individual levels. The source of spiritual leadership is 'inner life' or spiritual practice, which may include individual practices, such as meditation, prayer, yoga, journaling, or walking in nature, but also organizational spaces, such as rooms for silence and reflection. Inner life/spiritual practice positively influences the development of hope/faith in a transcendent vision and the values of altruistic love. Spiritual leadership fosters spiritual well-being (consisting of calling and membership) and a number of important individual and organizational outcomes (such as organizational commitment and productivity, financial performance, employee life satisfaction, and corporate social responsibility).³³

Besides the proposal by Fry, a variety of other authors approach the subject of spiritual leadership. Whittington and colleagues (2005:749) propose a causal model of spiritual leadership, which they term 'legacy leadership,' in which leadership effectiveness is determined by the "changed lives of followers". Krishnakumar and colleagues (2015) present a spiritual contingency model of spiritual leadership. Contingencies are "if-then conditions" (Krishnakumar et al. 2015: 24). They propose that the influence of spiritual leadership (characterized by interconnectedness, faith, and charisma) on workplace outcomes (such as in-role and extra-role performance, organizational commitment, and job satisfaction) is moderated by narcissism, pro-social motivation to lead, perceived organizational support, and perceived leader integrity (2015:229).

In conclusion, research on the relationship between fsw and leadership has so far been strongly focused on the idea of 'spiritual leadership'. Research efforts in this area of fsw display a strong quantitative orientation.

33 For a graphic sketch of the spiritual leadership model, see Fry and Cohen (2009:270).

It should be noted that Fry's spiritual leadership model is one of the few comprehensive approaches to organizational spirituality which explicitly includes the concept of spiritual practice. However, with its focus on outcomes and on creating vision and value congruence in an organization, it provides a formidable target for the instrumentalism criticism (see 3.4). Nevertheless, in its comprehensive approach, it does not focus on outcomes only, but places them in an overall framework, ranging from the sources of spiritual leadership to its outcomes, which also considers individual and organizational levels of the formation of spiritual leadership. Having addressed research on fsw in its relationship to leadership in this subsection, I will now turn to the relationship between fsw and management in the next subsection.

3.3.2 *Fsw and management/management education*

How is fsw related to management? While I earlier addressed the question of the attitude of those responsible for an organization toward fsw in the organization they are responsible for (see 3.2.1), I will focus in this section on the question of how fsw influences the practice of managing an organization. First, I will discuss the three contributions on spiritual management and, subsequently, address studies that focus on spirituality in management educational settings.

First, Steingard (2005) posits a complementary relationship between traditional management theory and “spiritually informed management theory” (2005:228) and offers a theory of spiritually informed management. His approach represents “the spiritual cycle of learning and action at the psycho-spiritual level of learning and action of the individual manager” (2005:230). Spiritually informed management *includes but transcends* traditional (conventional) management. On an ontological continuum³⁴, a manager develops from being materially oriented to being spiritually oriented, that is, from management rooted in the material dimension of reality, to managerial practice that “transcends materiality and comprises reality's spiritual dimension” (2005:233). On an epistemological continuum, the spiritually informed manager moves from a personal to a transpersonal orientation, that is, (s)he is “moving beyond the self into wider realities” (2005:231). In terms of the two continua (ontological and epistemological), the management process follows a “perpetually iterative ascension–decension cycle” (2005:231). In addition, managers move through a progressive

34 On the left side of the model, see the figure in Steingard (2005:231).

cycle of the three stages of awareness, change, and manifestation (2005:234). At all stages, a manager may or may not cross the “metaphysical breakthrough threshold” (2005:233) and thus either manage spiritually (above the line) or in a traditional mode (below the line).³⁵ In the stage of awareness, the relevant distinction between spiritually informed and spiritually uninformed management is that of conscious and unconscious awareness (2005:234). At the stage of change, the difference is found between transformative (in terms of consciousness) and translative (mainly intellectual) practices. At the stage of manifestation, traditional management is temporal in its outcomes, while spiritual management is orientated toward perennial outputs. That is, while the first is merely profit-oriented, the latter targets the triple bottom line of profit, people, and planet (2005:238). Thus, the correlation is drawn between spiritual states of being and managerial outcomes: “managers operating at higher levels of awareness (spirituality) will generate outcomes that benevolently and effectively serve humanity and the planet” (2005:238f). In summary, Steingard construes the notion of spiritual (or spiritually informed) management in relation to a conventional approach to management.

Second, Dyck (2014) offers similar contrasting of management approaches. He terms the two contrasting styles of management ‘mainstream’ and ‘alternative’ approaches to management and argues that spiritual practice consistently leads to alternative approaches to management. In particular, Dyck (2014) reviews the literature on religion and management and proposes a framework for categorizing articles in terms of two distinctions as regards, first, how religion ‘speaks’ to or informs management and, second, the content of what religion is saying to (or how it informs) management. First, the two main means are ‘written scriptures’ (ancient writings and holy texts) and experiential ‘spiritual practices’ (prayer, meditation, etc.). Second, in terms of what religion is saying to management, he distinguishes between ‘enhancing’ approaches that seek to support and enhance mainstream management theory and practices, and ‘liberating’ approaches that are radically critical of mainstream management and propose alternative ways of managing.

To distinguish conventional from alternative management approaches, Dyck draws on Weber’s notion of a materialistic–individualistic iron cage. This iron cage came in to being as a form of the Protestant ethic which has lost its grounding in religious forces and “encaptured society” (Dyck 2014:26). This materialistic–individualistic iron cage works in conventional

35 See the figure in Steingard (2005:231).

or mainstream management theory and practice through an emphasis on self-interest and profits. *Enhancing* approaches to management “argue that religious ideas are basically supportive of conventional management theory and practice” and “often offer ways to improve it or make it more ethical or honest” (Dyck 2014:31). In contrast, *liberating* approaches to management are critical of conventional approaches to management and “transform conventional emphases on self-interests and financial wealth maximization (iron cage)” (Dyck 2014:31).

These two distinctions (scriptures vs. spiritual practices; enhancement vs. liberation), result in a framework of four categories of literature: scriptural enhancement, spiritual enhancement, scriptural liberation, and spiritual liberation.³⁶ By focusing on the world’s largest religions (Buddhism, Christianity, Confucianism, Hinduism, and Islam), Dyck (2014) finds that, as regards scriptures, half of the studies he reviewed support mainstream management (which he terms scriptural enhancement), while the other half interpret scriptures as being critical of mainstream management (which he terms scriptural liberation). With respect to spiritual practices, the picture is different: “Taken together, the empirical results presented here are clear and consistent: spiritual practices result in decreased emphasis on financial and individual well-being, and increased emphasis on holistic wellbeing of the collective (especially the marginalized)” (2014:51) and

empirical studies that examine spiritual practices consistently point to liberation from conventional management. Not one study was found which said that managers who practiced spiritual disciplines—like prayer, meditation, mindfulness—became more inclined toward conventional management theory and practice (...) these similar themes and findings are evident across all of the leading world religions (Dyck 2014:52).

Third, a different typology is suggested by Pinha e Cunha, Rego, and D’Oliveira (2006).³⁷ They propose a typology of organization and management theories in terms of organizational spiritualities, distinguishing between how they view people (as independent or dependent) and their model of management (as spiritually informed or spiritually uninformed). This approach results in four types of organization: the soulful organization

36 See the figure in Dyck (2014:30). Note that Dyck, probably because of his support of a theological turn in management, uses the phrase “God on management” and equals it with “religion on management”. This terminology is a separate issue which I cannot address here. In the present review, I am concerned more narrowly with Dyck’s categorization of the literature.

37 On their approach, see also section 3.2.1 on organizational attitudes toward fsw.

(viewing people as dependent, spiritually informed management practice), the ascetic organization (dependent people, management as spiritually uninformed practice), the holistic organization (independent people, spiritually informed management), and the professional organization (independent people, spiritually uninformed management practice). This results in two organizational options for a spiritually informed management approach: viewing people as dependent (soulful organization) or viewing them as independent (holistic organization).³⁸

Fourth, a number of publications address the integration of spirituality into management education (e.g. Ackers & Preston 1997, Boozer 1998, Cavanagh 1999, Crossman 2015b, Cullen 2011, Daniels, Franz & Wong 2000, Epstein 2002, Lenssen 2010, Marcic 2000, Neal 1997) and higher education (e.g. Bugenhagen 2009). Arguments presented for the integration of spirituality into management education include an increase in interest in spirituality in the workplace shown by business people (Crossman 2015b) and the business faculty (Cavanagh 1999). Practitioners indicate that the integration of spirituality into the business curriculum may help them find a balance between tangible outcomes and immaterial concerns (Crossman 2015b). For the sake of a coherent life, Epstein (2002) argues it is important to integrate teachings drawn from religious traditions into management education (see also 4.1). However, spirituality/religion should be integrated in such a way that allows for spiritual diversity (Crossman 2015b:376f) and respect for others, and the inclusion of lessons from faith traditions in management education should aim at intellectual illumination, not indoctrination, says Epstein (2002).³⁹

Cullen (2008) explores the form of management and the “genre of manager” suggested by recent interest in organizational spirituality and spiritual learning. In his view, spiritual management learning approaches attempt to clarify a new spiritualized form of managerial self that recognizes both the immanent and transcendent needs of workers and organizations (2008:264).

A number of studies address different sources for the integration of spirituality into management education. Some authors focus on sacred texts as a possible source. Marcic (2000) reports on a course on spiritual values in organizations. She used sacred texts from the world’s major religions and

38 An additional view on fsw and management is presented by Daniels, Franz, and Wong (2000). They argue that particular views of business which carry managerial implications are implicit in one’s conception of spirituality. For an overview of their approach, see 3.2.2.

39 See also Burrell and Rahim (2018) on the concept of ‘religious literacy in the workplace’.

three different models to interpret these texts in light of current organizational issues (such as productivity, turbulence, turnover, employee satisfaction, team development, et cetera). She reports that students felt that the course helped them to understand “the connection between the world of work and the world of spirit” (2000). Lenssen (2010) presents an approach to biblical texts which can be used in executive education in secular settings. His approach aims at enabling executives to draw practical wisdom from biblical texts, which can support them in dealing with the challenges they face during their work.

Focusing not on specific texts but on the transfer of a particular concept, Ackers and Preston (1997) argue that the evangelical Christian notion of conversion and radical personal change has been introduced into management thinking⁴⁰ and has been applied to management development. They show how a particular management development program uses personal experience to remold individual personality and, as a result, corporate culture, and in this way mimics the conversion process (1997:677).

Bell and Taylor (2004) argue that the intellectual sources of a spiritual approach to management development (which they refer to as SMD) lie in the human potential movement and in transpersonal psychology, in particular the thinking of Maslow and Fromm, and the psychological frameworks of Jung and Assagioli. In their view, SMD encourages individuals “to search for meaning in their everyday working life through engagement with an inner self” (Bell & Taylor 2004:439). This focus on a search for meaning and self-understanding marks SMD, in their view, as implicitly religious (2004:439.443).

To sum up, management can be conceptualized as, potentially, a spiritual practice (by contrasting spiritual and conventional management). In relation to this, scholars have pointed to an increasing interest in spirituality in management education, and researchers have explored the influence of some religio-spiritual sources and concepts in management education and have noted the potential of using religious texts and concepts in management educational settings.

40 A development which they claim is related to the revival of the charismatic form of authority (1997:677).

3.3.3 *Fsw and entrepreneurship*

How is fsw related to entrepreneurship? Given the importance of such notions as vocation and creativity in entrepreneurship, it seems to be an area with various potential connections to fsw. Dodd and Seaman (1998) argue in “Religion and enterprise” that the relationship between religion and enterprise is complex, multilayered and interdependent (1998:71.83). Individual religion influences the entrepreneurial activity of believers, the decision to become an entrepreneur, enterprise management, and the entrepreneur’s networking activities and social capital. In “The interrelationships between entrepreneurship and religion”, Dodd and Gotsis (2007) conclude that the interrelationship between religion and entrepreneurship is highly context-specific (2007:102). In particular, the entrepreneur’s belief matrix influences the entrepreneurial process by setting criteria to be observed, depending on the degree of religious salience.⁴¹ Dodd and Gotsis (2007) also conclude that religion affects the psychological state of an entrepreneur. Reversely, an entrepreneur’s religious beliefs, values, and identity are affected by demographic and cultural conditions.

These interrelationships and interdependencies between religiosity, entrepreneurship, and contextual conditions are addressed by researchers in a number of ways. First, a focus on the influence of religiosity/spirituality on entrepreneurship is adopted. Second, the influence of entrepreneurship on religiosity/spirituality is addressed. Third, some studies compare the religiosity/spirituality of entrepreneurs to that of non-entrepreneurs. Fourth, a number of studies explore the particularities of the religiosity/spirituality of entrepreneurs with respect to different contexts.

First, in “Religiosity and spirituality in entrepreneurship: A review and research agenda”, Balog, Baker, and Walker (2014) review the literature on the influences of spirituality and religiosity on entrepreneurship and focus on the empirical contributions to the field. They conceptualize spirituality and religion in terms of the spiritual or religious *values* of the entrepreneur and use a framework to group the literature with respect to two levels, the individual (micro) level and the level of the organization (which they refer to as the “macro” level) (2014:165). At an individual level, they review studies which investigate the influence of religious and spiritual values on entrepreneurial motivations and attitudes, on responsible business behavior,

41 It is, however, not clear why this should be an implication of religion, which is particularly related to entrepreneurship, or if, in the statement above, ‘entrepreneur’ could be replaced by a more general term like ‘business manager’ or even ‘person’.

on physical health, and on psychological well-being. At the organization level, the studies they review address the influence of spiritual and religious values on firm creation, firm performance, sociocultural environment and others (see the figure in Balog et al. 2014:165)⁴². Griebel, Park, and Neubert (2014) study how faith functions as a frame for entrepreneurial activity and how entrepreneurial activity can result from the need to end tensions between faith and work. Neubert and colleagues (2015) propose that, in addition to financial, human, psychological, and social forms of capital, spiritual capital is a decisive additional influence on the innovation and performance of start-up firms in development contexts (Kenya and Indonesia). They found a significant relationship between an entrepreneur's spiritual capital and business innovation and performance.

Second, addressing the opposite direction of influence, that is, the impact of entrepreneurship on spirituality, Singh, Corner, and Pavlovich (2016) study how one particular aspect of entrepreneurial work, entrepreneurial failure, influences the spirituality of entrepreneurs in New Zealand. In contrast to approaches which apply psychological theories to venture failure, their research reveals that entrepreneurs engage deeply with failure (instead of indulging in self-deception and denial) and found that the spirituality of the entrepreneurs deepened through the experience of failure.

Third, there are studies that explore how the manifestation of religiosity of entrepreneurs differs from that of non-entrepreneurs. Dodd and Seaman (1998) quantitatively explore the level of religiosity among a large sample of British entrepreneurs and find it to be similar to that of non-entrepreneurial samples. Dougherty and colleagues (2013:401, see also Neubert 2013) study "patterns of religious belonging, belief, and behavior" of American entrepreneurs (established and nascent). The entrepreneurs do not differ from non-entrepreneurs with regard to religious affiliation, belief in God, or religious service attendance. They do, however, tend to see God as more personal and responsive (Dougherty et al. 2013:407) and pray more often (more than 50 percent pray daily, and one third pray several times a day) and are more likely to attend a place of worship where business activities are encouraged, that is, they worship in "pro-business congregations" (2013:407). Evangelicals in top positions, however, were not active in congregations, instead preferring small groups and invitation-only gatherings (2013:402). Nine out of ten entrepreneurs are affiliated with a religious tradition (about one third are evangelical Protestants, one quarter mainline

42 On the broader social impact of religion on business, see also Van Buren, Syed, and Mir (2019).

Protestants, with Catholics slightly under one quarter⁴³). Religious service is attended about once a month on average; one in three entrepreneurs attends church or mass at least weekly (2013:406).

Fourth, there are studies on the context-specific manifestation of the faith/religiosity of entrepreneurs (e.g. Cao 2007, Dana 2007, Gotsis & Kortezi 2009, and Wood & Heslam 2014). Cao (2007) presents an ethnographic account of Chinese Christian entrepreneurs in Wenzhou, China, with a focus on church–state interaction. Wenzhou is pioneering in developing China’s current market economy. He finds that the “regional capitalist development enabled by post-Mao reforms has largely depoliticized and promoted local practices of faith” (Cao 2007:45). This finding challenges the predominant view of state dominance and church resistance in Chinese Christian studies. The Christian entrepreneurs and the state share common interests, namely the pursuit of stability and development (2007:65). The Christian entrepreneurs actively seek the state’s recognition and adopt “their modern capitalist cultural logic in the production, management, and consumption of religious activities” (2007:45). Thus, the emerging market economy has molded the “post-socialist popular consciousness” and has “played a mediating role in church–state interaction” (2007:64). Dana (2007) explores entrepreneurship among the Amish people in Lancaster County (US). Gotsis and Kortezi (2009) explore the impact of Greek Orthodoxy on entrepreneurship. Wood and Heslam (2014) explore the influence of faith on business practice among Christian entrepreneurs in developing and emerging markets in Africa, Asia, and South America. These contexts are characterized by high levels of poverty and corruption. The Christian entrepreneurs show a “high sense of calling” (similar to entrepreneurs in developed contexts) and the pursuit of a “higher purpose” in terms of contributing to the alleviation of poverty through their business activities. Wood and Heslam (2014) found that because of their Christian faith, the entrepreneurs under study value reputation more highly than short-term profit. They adopt a zero-tolerance attitude toward corruption (“are willing to forgo business which cannot be won without corrupt dealing”, 2014:7) and have become known for this. In addition, the entrepreneurs under study exhibit a greater sense of dependence on God than entrepreneurs in developed contexts.

43 According to Neubert (2013), in the US the numbers of entrepreneurs from religions other than Christianity, as well as those who are atheists and agnostics, are small.

In summary, the relationship between fsw and entrepreneurship has attracted numerous studies, and various research efforts have illuminated the interrelationship between fsw, entrepreneurship, and contextual conditions. While the very notion of the entrepreneur remains somewhat vague (what distinguishes an entrepreneur from, say, a manager or a business leader?⁴⁴), it is, interestingly, in this segment of fsw where one finds research which is highly sensitive to the contextuality of manifestations of fsw. While this is understandable, given the importance of networking and social capital for entrepreneurial activity, it can be doubted that manifestations of fsw are less context-specific in other areas of study (such as leadership or management).

Moreover, with regard to the study of fsw, it seems that the terms ‘leadership’, ‘management’, and ‘entrepreneurship’ are better understood not as referring to different ‘things’, such as tasks, functions, or roles of people in work settings, but rather as constructs carrying different connotations and thus different emphases in terms of the people and their roles in work contexts, which are viewed under the labels of ‘leadership’, ‘management’, and ‘entrepreneurship’ (see also 3.5).

3.4 Assessing fsw

Many have argued that fsw needs to be assessed in terms of its outcomes and benefits and have thus focused their research on the outcomes of fsw. Others have sharply criticized such an emphasis on outcomes and have proposed various other considerations which need to be taken into account in the assessment of fsw. In the following two sections, I will first present outcome-oriented research and then address questions of justification, ethics, and critique of fsw.

3.4.1 *Outcomes of fsw*

Theory development in the field of fsw, as presented by Benefiel, Fry, and Geigle (2014)⁴⁵, culminates in the hypothesis that spirituality/religion in organizations positively influences important employee, organizational, and societal outcomes. They observe that a number of empirical studies using multiple measures found that SRW is positively related to different mea-

44 On concepts of entrepreneurship, see Rocha, Audretsch, and Birkinshaw (2013).

45 They use the acronym SRW to refer to the field of spirituality and religion in the workplace.

asures of performance (Benefiel et al. 2014:180). From a microeconomic perspective, Steiner, Leinert, and Frey (2010:10) suggest that there is a mixed picture with regard to the question of the individual influence of religion, in particular with regard to the question of whether religion improves people's income and labor market prospects. In addition, there are contradictory results regarding the question of the relationship between one's religion and economic attitudes. Steiner and colleagues (2010:11) also point out that research on correlations cannot establish the direction of causality: "It is unclear whether religion really affects behavior or whether people with certain character traits tend to be more religious."⁴⁶

The question of the outcomes and effects of fsw features prominently in the academic discussion of fsw. While some have fiercely criticized a focus on outcomes (see the following section), Steingard (2005) outlines that a *difference* in one's outcome orientation is a crucial distinction between a conventional approach to management and a spiritual approach to management. While the first is merely profit-oriented, the latter focuses on the triple bottom line of profit, people, and planet (2005:238). He proposes a correlation between a manager operating from a spiritual state and managerial outcomes: "managers operating at higher levels of awareness (spirituality) will generate outcomes that benevolently and effectively serve humanity and the planet" (2005:238f). In this section, I will discuss fsw literature that explores the outcomes of the incorporation of spirituality, religion, or faith at work. I found three main groups of publications in terms of the different types of outcome they address. One group focuses on outcomes in terms of ethical views and moral behavior, a second group addresses outcomes related to organizational commitment and performance, and a third group addresses faith-related implications.

1) Ethics-related outcomes: A crucial question is that of the influence of fsw on ethical judgment, ethical attitudes, and moral agency.⁴⁷ Agle and Van Buren (1999) empirically tested the relationships between religious upbringing, religious practice, Christian beliefs, and attitudes toward corporate social responsibility. They conclude that religious practice and Christian beliefs have a *weak* relationship to attitudes toward corporate social responsibility. Weaver and Agle (2002) suggest that religious role expectations, internalized as religious self-identity, may influence ethical behavior in organizations, but that this relationship is context-specific and particularly moderated by the organizational context (see also 3.2.3). Graafland, Mazereeuw,

46 On Max Weber's influence in fsw research, see also section 2.1.3.

47 The following overview is in chronological order.

and Yahia (2006) explore the relationship between Islamic religion and socially responsible business conduct among Dutch entrepreneurs. They find that common ideas of socially responsible business behavior correspond with the view of business in Islam, but that Muslims are less involved in applying socially responsible business practices than non-Muslim managers.⁴⁸ Brammer, Williams, and Zinkin (2007) explore the relationship between religious denomination and individual attitudes to corporate social responsibility in a large cross-country sample. They find that religious individuals tend to adopt broader conceptions of the social responsibilities of businesses than non-religious individuals. Dyck and Wong (2010) argue that the practice of four corporate spiritual disciplines (see also 3.2.1) facilitates the development of organizational virtues and moral agency in organizations. Westerman, Whitaker, and Hardesty (2013) argue that “belief in God” leads to the adoption of a stronger moral and other-centered value orientation in the workplace. Mazereeuw, Graafland, and Kaptein (2014) examine the relationships between religiosity, CSR attitudes, and CSR behavior. They find that the influence of religiosity on CSR behavior is mediated by CSR attitudes.

A related question is what type of religiosity influences ethical judgment and behavior. Clark and Dawson (1996) empirically explore the influence of personal religiousness on ethical judgments. They analyze religious motivations for ethical action and find significant differences in ethical judgments with respect to different categories in terms of the intrinsic and extrinsic religious motivation of respondents. They identify four types of individual with regard to religiousness: the pro-religious individuals (high intrinsic, high extrinsic), non-religious individuals (low intrinsic, low extrinsic), the intrinsic (high intrinsic, low extrinsic) and the extrinsic (low intrinsic, high extrinsic). Clark and Dawson’s research suggests that religiousness influences an individual’s behavior at work by providing a framework for ethical evaluations and a motivation for moral behavior. Longenecker, McKinney, and Moore (2004) study the impact of religious commitment and ethical judgment in business. They find little relation between religious commitment in broad faith categories (Catholic, Protestant, Jewish, other religion, no religion) and ethical judgment. However, individuals who indicated that religious interests were important to them showed higher levels of ethical judgment (were less accepting of unethical decisions) than those who do not. Brotheridge and Lee (2007, see also 2.2) draw on Clark and Dawson’s (1996) typology built on intrinsic and extrinsic religiousness and argue that

48 On religious traditions in fsw, see 4.1.

religion influences employee perceptions of work, organizational citizenship behavior, and workplace deviance. They argue that the “individual difference variable in organizational research” is the “nature of one’s religiosity rather than one’s religious affiliation” (2007:303). Adding to this, Walker, Smither, and DeBode (2012) study the effects of religiosity on ethical judgments. They focus on three religious attitudes, namely religious motivation (intrinsic vs. extrinsic), perceived sacred qualities of work, and views of God (loving vs. punishing). In contrast to an extrinsic religious motivation, an intrinsic religious orientation and having a loving view of God were both negatively associated with endorsing questionable ethical vignettes.

Another set of studies focuses on the relationship between spirituality and ethics. Giacalone and Jurkiewicz (2003) suggest that individual spirituality influences ethical perception. Ayoun, Rowe, and Yassine (2014) found that spirituality was not significantly correlated with ethical perception, ethical judgment, and ethical intention in the hospitality industry. Dyck (2014:55) argues that empirical research shows that spiritual practices consistently lead to the transformation of mainstream approaches to management (which emphasize individual and financial well-being) into alternative and radical approaches to management (which emphasize the holistic well-being of the collective). While (religious) scriptures are sometimes interpreted as enhancing ethics within a conventional management paradigm, studies on the influence of spiritual practices raise general questions concerning conventional management orientation (e.g. whether it is ethical to seek competitive advantage or maximize profits). McGhee and Grant (2016) explore the influence of spirituality on ethical action in organizations and conclude that spirituality is manifested through an awareness of others, which serves to empower authentic ethical action.

2) Organizational commitment and performance: Various studies address fsw in relation to organizational commitment. Kinjerski and Skrypnek (2008) find that a spirit at work program in a health care organization increased spirit at work, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and organizational culture, leading to a reduction in turnover and absenteeism and thus ultimately improving the quality of the care provided by the institution. Walker (2013) explores the relationship between faith–work integration (using the faith at work scale) and organizational commitment. He finds that faith–work integration is positively associated with three forms of organizational commitment (affective, normative, and continuance) (Walker 2013:459). Bell-Ellis and colleagues (2015, 2013) explore faith-related determinants of organizational commitment. They analyze the relationship

between spirituality at work⁴⁹ and organizational commitment at two universities, one faith-based, one secular. They find that employees with a higher level of spirit at work also scored higher in terms of organizational commitment, and that the employees from the faith-based institution scored higher in spirit at work than the employees from the secular institution. Roof (2015) finds that individual spirituality positively relates to employee engagement.

A number of studies address the relationship between organizational spirituality and organizational performance (see, e.g. Garcia-Zamor 2003, Jurkiewicz & Giacalone 2004, Karakas 2010, Krishnakumar & Neck 2002, and Poole 2009). Krishnakumar and Neck (2002:162) argue that managers should encourage spiritual diversity at work (encourage spirituality without favoring a particular form or view of spirituality), and this, they suggest, may increase organizational performance. Duchon and Ashmos Plowman (2005) argue that work unit spirituality is associated with work unit performance. Ibrahim and Angelidis (2005) analyze the long-term performance of small businesses, comparing “Christian-based” to secular companies and found significant differences in a number of performance variables. The former had higher sales growth rates and ROIs, and higher levels of productivity. Karakas (2010) reviews 140 papers on workplace spirituality, focusing on the question of how spirituality influences organizational performance. He identifies three ways in which spirituality supports organizational performance: first, by enhancing employee well-being and quality of life; second, by providing a sense of purpose and meaning at work; and third, by providing a sense of interconnectedness and community (Karakas 2010:2). Vallabh and Vallabh (2016) explore workplace spirituality as a cultural phenomenon and its relationship to organizational effectiveness. They conclude that organizations should allow for spiritual expression since it will positively affect organizational effectiveness in a variety of ways (2016:7). In spiritual leadership literature (see 3.3), the relationship between spiritual leadership and individual and organizational outcomes is also addressed.

In addition, a number of studies address other performance-related outcomes. In Tucker’s (2010:32–34) conceptual approach to faith–work integration, the integration of one’s faith and work fosters three attributes which he argues have a positive effect on work performance: unity of thought and the self (a ‘collected’ mind, single-mindedness), inner quietness (which includes being resistant to psychological stress), and self-knowledge.

49 Using Kinjerski and Skrypnek’s (2006) spirit at work scale.

Brügger (2010:156–169) proposes a three-layered framework of worldview–ethics–practice to study international management. He argues that, in international management contexts, a manager’s orientation toward God may lead, at the level of worldview, to the recognition of Christ as the overarching purpose, at the ethical level to freedom and orientation, and at the level of practice to focus and discernment in terms of business strategy. Goltz (2011) explores spirituality as a source of power. The four components of spiritual power (calmness, flexibility, empathy, and non-judgmental awareness) can be acquired through spiritual practice, and they increase the power-holder’s ability to influence others in a non-instrumental way (2011:351). Byrne, Morton, and Dahling (2011) study ways in which spirituality and religion influence emotional labor at work, which is, in particular, critical for the success of service-based organizations. Walker (2013:459, see above) also investigates the relationship between faith–work integration (using the faith at work scale) and satisfaction with life, the intent to leave one’s job, self-rated job performance, and job satisfaction. He finds that faith–work integration is positively associated with life satisfaction and the intent to leave one’s job(!), negatively associated with self-rated job performance, and not associated with job satisfaction (Walker 2013:459). Arnetz and colleagues (2013) find that employee spiritual values and practices foster mental well-being and attenuate stress. Stead and Stead (2014) argue that business organizations need to build spiritual capabilities (such as spiritual intelligence and spiritual capital) to sustain sustainability-based competitive advantages.

3) Faith-related effects: Some studies address the faith-related effects of the incorporation of spirituality, faith, or religion at work. Scheitle and Ecklund (2017) find that an increase in religion in the workplace leads to an increase in religion-related employment discrimination. McGhee and Grant (2016:3) propose that enacting one’s spirituality at work in turn leads to a “maturing process”, a growing of the spiritual self. Singh, Corner, and Pavlovich (2016) found that the spirituality of the entrepreneurs deepened through the experience of failure (see also 3.3.3).

In conclusion, the research that concentrates on the outcomes of fsw reveals a tendency regarding how the three terms of spirituality, religion, and faith are used. If the concept of religion is employed, the focus is often on the question of ethical/moral outcomes of religion at work, while the notion of spirituality seems to be more often, but not exclusively, used in relation to questions of organizational commitment and performance. In fsw research, one can thus find tendencies toward ethics-oriented research

on religion at work and performance-oriented research on spirituality at work.

Studies on the positive outcomes of fsw often seem to follow the logic that these positive fsw outcomes render fsw relevant for researchers and practitioners alike. However, many authors have criticized a narrow focus on outcomes in the evaluation and justification of fsw constructs. This is the theme of the literature introduced in the following section.

3.4.2 *Justification, ethics, and critique of fsw*

In this section, I will first offer a brief overview of proposals concerning the justification and evaluation of fsw. Second, I will present some of the main variations of the criticism of the instrumentality of fsw. Third, I will briefly describe the criticism fsw has received for being too individualistic.

First, many have argued that fsw can be *justified* by establishing its positive relationship to individual and organizational performance and other beneficial outcomes. For example, Houghton, Neck, and Krishnakumar (2016), in their article on “the what, why and how of spirituality in the workplace”, structure the section on ‘the why’ of spirituality in the workplace according to the various benefits it promises to offer (such as intuition and creativity, honesty and trust, personal fulfillment, commitment, organizational performance, job satisfaction, reduced intention to quit, organizational citizenship behavior, ethics, job involvement, buffering the negative effects of emotional labor, employee well-being, and reduced career and social costs for women). Such approaches which focus on the benefits of fsw have been sharply criticized by others as being instrumentalist (see below in this section).

A number of authors have proposed different criteria for the evaluation of fsw. Cavanagh and Bandsuch (2002) propose that the criteria for business leaders to assess the spiritualities manifested at work is a spirituality’s ability to promote good moral behavior and good character. Hicks (2002, 2003) proposes “respectful pluralism” (2002:392) as an evaluative frame and argues that those responsible for an organization should foster an organizational culture which allows for religious and spiritual diversity. Sheep (2006) proposes a “person–organization fit” approach to workplace spirituality. Gotsis and Kortezi (2008:587) explore the three ethical traditions of deontology, utilitarianism, and virtue ethics as a possible basis (in the sense of a theoretical or philosophical justification) of workplace spirituality and conclude that workplace spirituality can be based on virtue ethics or a

deontological framework, while utilitarianism is not a suitable foundation for workplace spirituality (2008:593–595). Brophy (2014) argues for incorporating spiritual values into a business company to the extent that these values are shared by the principals of the organization. In such an approach, the spirituality of a company's leaders becomes decisive for the whole organization.

Second, some authors have criticized *instrumentalist* tendencies in contemporary (academic and popular) approaches to fsw. Because the substance of this criticism varies considerably and confronts fsw research with crucial questions, I will, in the following, describe the variations of this criticism at more length than other studies discussed so far. In particular, I will focus on texts by Bell and Taylor (2003), Benefiel (2003), Driscoll and Wiebe (2007), Case and Gosling (2010), Long and Helms Mills (2010), and Long and Driscoll (2015).⁵⁰

Emma Bell and Scott Taylor argue that the workplace spirituality discourse is not new and that “the relationship between organizations and spirituality has a long and complex history” (2003:343). They suggest that management has “acquired some of the language and characteristics of religion, albeit in a secularized version” (2003:330). In their view, popular management and business literature (which includes academic and practitioner texts, see 2003:329) has focused on workplace spirituality since the 1990s. This discourse explores the meaning of work in relation to a “higher purpose” (2003:330), and encourages a view of organizations as “communal centers” (2003:330) and as neutral contexts which provide opportunities for spiritual expression and spiritual growth (2003:343). In their view, the popular discourse of workplace spirituality can be located within the broader rubric of the New Age movement, which employs a pick and mix approach to religion. It exists in dynamic tension with both science and religion, “attempting to combine the values of post-materialist society with an ideology of self-fulfillment and self-discovery by repackaging religion, psychology and therapy” (2003:331). The workplace spirituality discourse is instrumentalist in that it “ensures that the search for meaning is harnessed to specific organizational purposes” (2003:332). Bell and Taylor argue that its focus on the measurement and management of spirituality shows that this discourse is “an attempt to mobilize the individual to serve the interests

50 For additional variations of the criticism of instrumentality in fsw, see also Boje 2008, Brooke & Parker 2009, Fenwick & Lange 1998, Forray & Stork 2002, Lips-Wiersma, Lund Dean & Fornaciari 2009, LoRusso 2017, Tourish & Tourish 2010, and Vaidyanathan 2020.

of the organization” (2003:337), and that the discourse seeks to “reconcile individual and organizational interests” (2003:336). The discourse of workplace spirituality and its effects can be understood by drawing from a Foucauldian notion of “pastoral power” and from Max Weber’s notion of the Protestant work ethic (2003:340f). “Pastoral power” is a specific form of power over groups and individuals which has its origins in the Christian metaphor of the shepherd and the idea of Christian pastorship as a technology of power, which, according to Foucault, has emerged as a central characteristic of the modern Western state (2003:341). Drawing on Max Weber’s thesis, Bell and Taylor suggest that the notion of the Protestant work ethic represents a translation of the concept of religious vocation or calling into a secular context (2003:338).⁵¹ The Protestant ethic shaped the development of capitalism, and the current workplace spirituality discourse is a “revival of the Protestant ethic” (2003:344) in that it seeks to resolve the dilemmas created by the structural conditions of capitalism by developing an inner sense of meaning and virtue. However, whereas the Protestant work ethic represents a “transcendent philosophy” (2003:344) which understands “economic work as in the service of God”, the current workplace spirituality discourse represents an “immanent philosophy” in which work is perceived as a path to personal growth. Thus, the workplace spirituality discourse reconceptualizes the Protestant work ethic according to “New Age values” (2003:345) and proposes that spiritual and economic aims can be made commensurate.

Margaret Benefiel (2003) argues that management scholars approach the subject of fsw with the research methods and methodology they were trained in. They thus focus strongly on the measurement of spirituality and its impact on organizational performance, and the deeper question of the instrumentality of spirituality remains unaddressed. She asks: “If spirituality is ultimately about nonmaterialistic concerns, is it appropriate to focus on the material gains to be reaped by integrating spirituality into organizational life?” (2003:384). Benefiel expresses concerns that talk about spirituality is merely superficial, and that, due to a superficial understanding of spirituality, organizations are prone to abandon the spiritual path as soon as they hit “the inevitable bumps on the spiritual journey” (2003:384). To remedy this superficiality, she argues that the study of spirituality in the workplace needs to be “critical, analytical, theoretical, and not reductionist” (2003:385).

51 See also 2.1.3 on the role of Max Weber’s thought in fsw research.

Cathy Driscoll and Elden Wiebe (2007) address the predominant instrumental approach to workplace spirituality by drawing on Jacques Ellul's notion of *technique*. They refer to such an instrumental understanding as "technical spirituality at work" (Driscoll & Wiebe 2007). They argue that, according to Ellul, technical processes were originally "created to serve a limited economic rationality" but have come to "predominate Western thinking" in such a way that *technique* has become an end in itself. Driscoll and Wiebe (2007) demonstrate how the current workplace spirituality movement is dominated by *technique* in a number of respects (its quest for results, its use of experts, and its broadening and dissolution of the notion of spirituality). Technical spirituality has, however, not led to the fundamental transformation of the business world which it seems to promise: "By bringing a myth of meaningful work to a dehumanized workplace, the technician calls it progress" (Driscoll & Wiebe 2007). However, "there has been no significant transformation in business since the recent flourishing of workplace spirituality" (2007). They argue that technical spirituality is "a formidable opponent to authentic spirituality" (2007). While they suggest that there are no general answers to what constitutes authentic spirituality, they propose that "each person must find ways to resist and transcend the pull of *technique* and to put it back in its proper place as secondary" (2007).

Peter Case and Jonathan Gosling (2010) provide a critical review of the literature on workplace spirituality. Their main criticism targets the "performative" (2010:257) treatment of workplace spirituality "as a resource or means to be manipulated instrumentally and appropriated for economic ends" (2010:257). They discuss the notion of the "spiritual organization" and, linked to it, two alternative positions with respect to workplace spirituality: first, the spiritual organization may refer to a type of organization which seeks to "control the bodies, minds, emotions and souls of employees" (2010:257) through social technologies. Second, it may be understood as the site used by employees to pursue their own spiritualities. This is a form of "reverse instrumentalism" (2010:257). In addition, they suggest a third possible position toward workplace spirituality, which rejects it as a "discrete subject of study" (2010:276). In this view, the workplace is just one of many contexts in which the spiritual journey may or may not be pursued. There is, in this third perspective, no particular relationship between 'workplace' and 'spirituality'.

Brad Long and Jean Helms Mills (2010) address workplace spirituality understood in terms of organizational culture. Such an approach promotes the idea that the adherence of organizational members to a particular set of values which give meaning to the workplace leads to the rise of a spiritual

culture in an organization.⁵² Such an understanding is, however, prone to potential managerial instrumentalization, in that it may serve as an implicit form of managerial control. Managerial control is achieved via the meaning-providing function of the values promoted. In particular, managerial control via the establishing of a spiritual culture is achieved by “restricting the space in which alternative meanings can be expressed” (2010:329), in other words, by managing the sensemaking of the people managers lead. Critical approaches to sensemaking point out that “power and context” (2010:329) determine what types of sensemaking are dominant. This works via the use of specific vocabulary and metaphors to control social action. The use of metaphors offers a certain clarity, while at the same time constrains thinking and hides alternatives (2010:329). In the literature on workplace spirituality, Long and Helms Mills (2010) find that texts which define spirituality as a set of values and prescribe a spiritual culture tend to be “limited to positivist scholarship, managerial prerogative and Western traditions of thought” (2010:330). These texts emphasize the practical utility of spirituality, connect it to organizational performance, and promote an instrumental understanding of spirituality. Spirituality then serves as a means to organizational and economic ends (2010:331). Long and Helms Mills (2010:332) analyze Mitroff and Denton’s (1999a) “Spiritual audit of corporate America” to demonstrate how the metaphors used shape and constrain the thinking of its audience. For example, the idea of work as a calling and a form of surrendering to a higher authority may serve to reinforce “rules of submission and duty” (2010:334). Such texts thus seek to limit sensemaking and, ultimately, agency, to construct a desired social reality. Promoting a spiritual culture may thus lead to monocultures which replace cultural diversity, and in which employees either have to adapt their beliefs and values or leave the organization (2010:335). In conclusion, Long and Helms Mills (2010:336) concede that “a spiritual culture may indeed be more benign than some alternatives”, for example a criminal culture, but that nevertheless “culture is a controlling discourse” which links personal meaning to organizational meaning. They propose a form of critical spirituality which seeks to overcome social domination and oppression, and which unites people around the values of humanity, equality, and liberation. In their (2010:338) view, this critical spirituality challenges the “domination of managerial instrumentality” and “promotes the rediscovery of a sense of enchantment that modernity has stripped from everyday life”.

52 Which Long and Helms Mills (2010:326) refer to as a “values-based approach” to workplace spirituality (for an example, see Delbecq 2010).

Brad Long and Cathy Driscoll (2015) offer a discourse analysis on workplace spirituality. They conclude by arguing that this discourse seems to be a “sheep in wolf’s clothing” (2015:964) with problematic inherent tensions. On the one hand, the discursive activity of its authors seems to be driven by “very sincere and altruistic motives” (2015:964) to improve workplaces. However, workplace spirituality authors draw upon discourses which “created the kind of workplaces they now seek to change” (2015:964). The workplace spirituality discourse is thus marked by the “failure to challenge dominant ideologies” and by an emphasis on “management power, wealth maximization, competitive forces and individualism” (2015:964).

These critical texts on instrumentality in workplace spirituality present a variety of critical reflections on spirituality in organizational contexts. It is to be noted here that the issues these authors bring to bear on the topic of workplace spirituality, such as discourse and power in organizational settings, reflect topics important for a larger strand in management research often referred to as critical management studies (see e.g. Alvesson & Willmott 1992). How is this criticism of the instrumentalist tendencies of fsw to be addressed? Some of the authors discussed above have indicated strategies based on their analyses of the problem: Benefiel (2003:385) calls for a non-superficial academic study of spirituality in the workplace, Driscoll and Wiebe (2007) argue in favor of transcending technical spirituality with authentic spirituality, and Long and Helms Mills (2010) call for critical spirituality. In addition, as a possible resolution of the instrumentality question, Benefiel, Fry, and Geigle (2014) have suggested that the question of whether spirituality should serve as a *technique* for instrumental ends or as an organizing principle should not be viewed as an either/or proposition. Furthermore, Sheep (2006:357) has proposed a multiparadigm approach for fsw research which avoids privileging “one research interest over another” (e.g. instrumentality, individual fulfillment, or the good of society).

Third, in addition to the criticism of the instrumentalist tendencies of fsw, a variety of criticisms have been raised against a seemingly predominant individualist emphasis in workplace spirituality.⁵³ One issue is that the current ‘spirituality at work movement’ can be criticized for being dominated by an individualist view of spirituality, where individual-level concepts of spirituality, such as spiritual well-being, spiritual distress, spiritual development, and the individual expression of an authentic self, are predominant (see Hudson 2014:34 and the literature there). This individualist focus is prone to ignore the importance of organizational, social, and political struc-

53 For an overview, see Hudson (2014:34–35).

tures *in their relation* to individuals. Hudson argues that treating individual employees as isolated entities as, in his opinion, most of the spirituality at work literature does, is misleading. Hudson refers to Charles Taylor's notions of a 'secular age' and 'culture of authenticity' and proposes viewing this individualism as a particularly modern and Western phenomenon, in which individuals choose their way to live and religion is a matter of choice. A related criticism of individualist innerness is leveled by Emma Bell (2008, 2007). She advocates a critical spirituality of organization by drawing upon two historical cases, the French worker-priests and the British industrial mission. Both cases represent a synthesis of Marxism and Christianity in the form of "a practice-based morality" (2008:293). Such an approach is complementary to approaches to workplace spirituality which are characterized by a preoccupation with the "interior search for meaningful existence" (2008:293) because it involves a "concern for the exterior, political and social aspects of religion" (2008:293). While in this section the intention was mainly to provide an overview of different approaches, in section 4.3.4 I will look at a possible answer to some of the criticisms raised here. In the following section, I will sketch the preliminary conclusions with regard to the theoretical contours of fsw as discussed so far.

3.5 Conclusions and outlook

In chapter one, I proposed the following questions to guide the review of the literature for this dissertation:

- 1) How are fsw constructs defined in the literature? (chapter 2)
- 2) How is fsw related to and situated in theoretical contexts in terms of academic disciplines and discourses, important thinkers and methodological traditions and approaches? (chapter 2)
- 3) How can fsw as a research area be presented from an overview perspective and how can the research area be structured? (chapter 3)
- 4) What theory building efforts have been undertaken and what aspects of a theoretical analysis of fsw are addressed? (chapter 3)
- 5) *In what way does fsw research contribute to the study of Christians in contemporary workplaces?* (chapter 4)
- 6) *What can theological approaches to work/work contexts contribute to the study of Christians at work?* (chapter 5)

So far, chapters 2 and 3 together provide an attempt to explore available answers to the first four of the above questions concerning the definition, overview, structure, and contents of extant theory of what I have termed

fsw research. In chapter 2, I addressed the issue of definitions of fsw and identified some of the key problems with defining fsw concepts (question 1). Additionally, I sketched how fsw is related to a number of theoretical contexts, such as academic discourses and methodological contexts (question 2). In the present chapter, I outlined what seem to me to be some of the main theory building efforts in fsw undertaken so far. In particular, the chapter offers a possible rough structuring of fsw research (question 3) and presents key contents of fsw theory as developed in extant research (question 4). What remains as yet largely unaddressed (in italics above) are the questions of the contributions of fsw research (question 5) and of theological approaches (question 6) to the study of Christians in contemporary work settings. In addition, while question 1 (definitions) has been addressed, some major problems concerning it still remain unresolved. However, the research discussed in the present chapter allows this question to be pursued further.

In sections 3.5.1 and 3.5.2, I will evaluate how the theoretical fragments and building blocks of fsw, as outlined in this chapter, contribute to addressing the question of fsw definitions. At the end of chapter 2, I identified two problem areas with reference to current definitions of key concepts in fsw. First, the vagueness, abstractness, and confusion with regard to the main terms and, second, the problem of the relationship between fsw's main concepts and the study of Christians, and the related question of the meaning and function of the label 'Christian' with regard to fsw concepts. In the light of the theory discussed in the present chapter, an additional problem area relevant for the definition of fsw constructs needs to be identified: the ambiguities that come with the use of workplace-related constructs in fsw research, such as management, work, leadership, business, et cetera. I will now, first, elaborate on the problem of the faith, spirituality, and religion terminology in fsw in the light of the present chapter (3.5.1). Second, I will sketch the terminological problem area concerning the use of workplace-related concepts in fsw (3.5.2). In section 3.5.3, I will prepare the way for addressing the relationship between fsw and the study of Christians at work (question 5 of the above questions), which will be explored in more detail in chapter 4. Subsequently, I will address the question of theology and the study of Christians at work (question 6 of the above questions) in chapter 5.

3.5.1 *The terms faith, spirituality, and religion in fsw theory*

With regard to the problem of the *vagueness* (see 2.2.5) of key fsw terms, the conceptual linkage of spirituality with relevant workplace activities such as working (3.1.2), leading (3.3.1), or managing (3.3.2) allows the vagueness problem to be partially remedied by tying spirituality closely to such practices. In addition, the texts discussed in section 3.4.2 on the justification, ethics, and critique of fsw have made the case that the question of the clarity or vagueness of the construct is not the single relevant criterion with regard to the justification of fsw as a distinct area of study. Rather, such questions need to be set within a broader context in which questions of the legitimacy, justification, and critique not only of fsw constructs, but of the phenomena they refer to, need to be considered as well.

The use of different fsw terms adds to the vagueness problem. As far as the relationship between fsw terms is concerned, proposals for clarifying the terms faith, spirituality, and religion *in their relationships to each other* (see 2.2.4), while they might succeed in clarifying the terminology used in particular research endeavors, appear somewhat artificial. This question seems to be resistant to a satisfying general conceptual resolution. Below⁵⁴, I will suggest that clarification of the label ‘Christian’ can lead to clarification of the meaning of these terms and their relationship with reference to the study of Christians.⁵⁵

With reference to the *abstractness* problem of fsw’s key terms (see 2.2.5), the criticism of the abstractness of the term ‘spirituality’ can be addressed now. A main asset in existing fsw research in this regard is that there are a number of studies which explore concrete spiritual practices in the workplace (see 3.1). In addition, there are a fair number of studies which propose specifications of the characteristics of the activities of working (3.1.2), leading (3.3.1), and managing (3.3.2) as *spiritual practices*. There are thus serious proposals on the table as to how one can conceive of spiritual work, spiritual leadership, and spiritual management. If we consider practices in this way, an allegedly abstract notion of ‘spirituality’ becomes more closely tied to what people actually do when they work, manage, or lead.

⁵⁴ See in particular chapter 7.

⁵⁵ I am thus proposing what Phipps and Benefiel (2013:36) categorize under a contextually determined juxtaposition of spirituality and religion, a juxtaposition *in the context of* the study of Christians at work.

Related to the above is the problem of *confusion* (see 2.2.5) with regard to what aspects the term spiritual does relate to. Extant research has, in my view convincingly, shown that the term spiritual can be reasonably (although not exclusively) tied to relevant workplace-related activities, such as working (3.1.2), managing (3.3.2), or leading (3.3.1). What reduces the confusion is, in my view, not so much the delineation of a single aspect (of people, workplaces, practices, values, etc.) to which the term spiritual should exclusively refer, but clarification of *how* the terms spiritual and spirituality relate to *different* aspects pertinent to work settings.⁵⁶

3.5.2 *Work-related concepts in fsw theory*

Adding to the semantic ambiguities regarding the concepts of faith, spirituality, and religion as employed in fsw research, there is a certain vagueness with reference to workplace-related concepts used, such as management, work, leadership, business, et cetera. It is, in other words, not only the ‘faith-part’ in the phrase ‘faith at work’ which is not clear, or not only the ‘religion-part’ in the phrase ‘management and religion’, or not only the ‘spiritual-part’ in the phrase ‘spiritual leadership’. In its reference to the workplace or work contexts, fsw research needs to work with some kind of broad (and sometimes implicit) conceptualization of work contexts or particular aspects of these contexts or relevant practices. Favorite concepts used in fsw publications are, for example, management, leadership, and entrepreneurship (see e.g. the literature discussed in 3.3), but other concepts are employed as well, such as business, work/workplace, corporation, or organization (e.g. Benefiel et al. 2014, Benefiel 2007, Black 2009, Delbecq 2004, Miller & Ewest 2013a, Van Duzer et al. 2007). In fsw research, these concepts carry different meanings and perform different functions. Moreover, these terms do not stand alone but, as the phenomena they refer to are interrelated, these terms are usually part of broader conceptual landscapes (e.g. the use of the term ‘business’ may imply a particular understanding of ‘management’), made explicit in varying degrees. In the light of their role in the context of these workplace-related conceptual landscapes, two different basic functions of these terms can roughly be identified. They either seem to serve as a place holder or label for the whole map, that is, the whole conceptual landscape in question, or they refer to a particular con-

56 While interesting general proposals exist on how spirituality relates to work, leadership, or management, what is lacking, in my view, are studies of the spiritual aspects of concrete tasks, such as, cooking, writing, train driving, or chairing a meeting.

ceptual aspect of the whole map. It is not always clear in a publication which function is intended. In addition, it has to be noted that some of these (and related) terms are used interchangeably.⁵⁷

In the following, I will illustrate this terminological problem by focusing on the use of the terms *management* and *manager* in fsw research. Gundolf and Filser's (2013) article may serve to illustrate the vagueness which results from this particular use of workplace-related concepts in fsw publications. In their title, they use the phrase "management research and religion" (2013:177). However, the literature they review seems not to focus specifically or exclusively on *management*, but on work in general. This can be seen, for example, in how they refer to their second cluster (in their clustering of the literature): According to the abstract of their article, the second cluster is concerned with "religion at work" (2013:177). However, in the text of the article they refer to the second cluster as being concerned with "the influence of religion on *management*" (2013:182, my emphasis). Are the terms work and management used as synonyms here? This is confusing because one might, for example, expect the study of religion and management to be a subfield of the broader field of religion and work, that is, a subfield that focuses on *managerial* work instead of work in general, or on *managers* as one specific section of the workforce. It is thus not clear why the terms management and work should be used interchangeably. A similar ambiguity is encountered in the journal entitled 'Journal of *Management, Spirituality & Religion*' (my emphasis), but which includes many articles that do not focus specifically on managers or managerial work, but on particular work contexts in more general terms (e.g. Aggarwal & Singh 2017 or Moran 2017).

Furthermore, the fsw literature discussed so far has often treated *work* in a generic way. It has addressed singular work-related issues, such as performance or job satisfaction. Or it has addressed other more general characteristics of work, such as work as something that demands attention and that sometimes includes repetitive behavior (Smith 2008). Some studies have addressed fsw with regard to particular work contexts, types of work, and professions (see 1.1). In the light of such studies, one may categorize studies on management and spirituality as a subgroup of these work-specific studies which focuses on a particular type of work, namely managerial work. Management, however, does not seem to be understood mainly as a particular type of work, nor can managers and non-managers easily be separated in an organization, as is indicated, for example, by Black's (2008:47)

⁵⁷ Delbecq (2004), for example, seems to use the terms 'manager', 'leader', and 'executive' interchangeably.

use of the term ‘corporate manager’ as referring to *all* participants of a corporation, or by Mintzberg’s (2009:12) definition of a manager as somebody who is responsible for an organization or an identifiable part of it (this definition may also include a large share of the people who work in an organization). Additionally, it is not always clearly identifiable how the terms managers and management are used at all.

Moreover, there are a number of additional terms which refer to similar or related phenomena, such as *leadership* or *entrepreneurship*. Since there are neither three identifiable groups of people out there who can be clearly labeled as managers, leaders, or entrepreneurs, nor three particular types of work which can be unambiguously marked as management, leadership, or entrepreneurship (see 3.3), the usage of these different terms in fsw research does not seem to add much clarity. Moreover, it is not always clear whether the decision to use one of these three terms is actually content-related (i.e. has something to do with the object under investigation), or has a stronger research-strategic dimension in that, for example, researchers want to position a study in a certain field (e.g. management studies or leadership research) or relate to a certain body of literature (e.g. the literature on entrepreneurship). Therefore, all the fsw studies that apply one of these terminologies can possibly contribute to the study of Christians at work.⁵⁸

Another source of confusion is the fact that phrases like ‘spirituality and leadership’ or ‘management and spirituality’ can refer to at least two very different, yet related topics and questions. They can refer to either the question of how an individual who is responsible for a certain organization deals or should deal with the issue that *in the organization for which she is responsible* people integrate or try to integrate their faith or spirituality into their work. Or they can refer to the question of how an individual who is responsible for a certain organization integrates or tries to integrate her faith into her (managerial) work.⁵⁹ If it addresses the former question, such research is identical in its focus to what I have below referred to as organizational

58 In this regard, the label ‘Christians at work’ has no advantage over the labels faith, spirituality, or religion at work, but is subject to the same vagueness (or broadness) that comes with employing the phrase ‘at work’.

59 The distinction between the spiritual manager/leader and the spiritual person seems to offer itself here, as it mimics the distinction between the moral manager/leader and the moral person in ethical leadership theory (see Mabey et al. 2017:760, and the literature there). Interestingly, Mabey and colleagues (2017:761) argue that followers of Jesus are called to be spiritual individuals, but not spiritual leaders. This is one of the building blocks of their answer to the criticism of instrumentalist tendencies in fsw (which they refer to as manipulation, see 4.3.4).

level fsw (see 3.2.1). The latter question is related to individual-level fsw (see 3.2.2) and to the question of the relationship between management and spirituality (see 3.3).

In summary, with reference to these workplace-related concepts employed in fsw research, three things seem to be noteworthy. First, fsw research, in its focus on work contexts, works with a (sometimes implicit) conceptual map pertinent to the work contexts that are addressed. Second, different workplace-related terms, such as business or management, can be used either to refer to one concept within this conceptual map (such as management as a function within a business enterprise, see Delbecq 2004, or within a corporation, see Black 2009). Or they can serve as a placeholder, referring not so much to an individual concept, but to the whole map of workplace-related concepts, that is, to work contexts in more general terms (see e.g. Gundolf & Filser 2013⁶⁰). Third, the two different functions cannot always be clearly differentiated between. Given this terminological situation in fsw research, I suggest that terms like ‘leadership’, ‘management’, and ‘entrepreneurship’ are better understood as not referring to different ‘things’, such as tasks, functions, or roles of peoples in work settings. Rather, they can be understood as constructs that carry different connotations and thus different emphases in terms of the phenomena, people, and their roles in work contexts that are viewed under such labels as ‘leadership’, ‘management’, and ‘entrepreneurship’. In this respect, I intentionally use the term ‘work’ in the phrase ‘the study of Christians at work’ in a broad sense to refer to contemporary Western work contexts and what takes place therein, including different aspects of work (such as management, leadership, or entrepreneurship), different work settings (such as business contexts), and types of work.

3.5.3 *Fsw theory and the study of Christians at work*

Interestingly, from the overview of fsw research presented so far, it has remained almost completely unclear what its particular contribution to the study of Christians in present-day workplaces might be. This conclusion may surprise the reader, but so far, in the theoretical conceptions of fsw introduced, the particular theme of Christians *existing as Christians* in contemporary workplaces has hardly been addressed and, therefore, any conclusion that fsw and the study of Christians are related must rest on the

60 In their approach, management and work seem to refer to a large semantic area lacking clearly defined contents and boundaries.

general assumption that spirituality, religion, faith, and the existence of Christians in work contexts are, in any case, somehow linked. However, if one assumes this relationship as given for a moment, it seems remarkable that large parts of the theory of fsw can be introduced without particular reference to Christians or Christian existence in the workplace. Given this, a very basic question emerges: How, then, are the notions of faith, spirituality, and religion related to the label 'Christian' and to the study of Christians in present-day work contexts? I propose that via this question, the vagueness–abstractness–confusion problems (see above) can be addressed and clarified, not in general, but in their relation to the study of Christians at work.

In this chapter, I have shown how current research helps to remedy some of the terminological problems concerning fsw concepts, but that new ambiguities occur as well. There is arguably no *general* solution to the problem of defining the trinity of faith, spirituality, and religion at work, and, generally speaking, these three terms necessarily mean different things to different people (including academics) and in different contexts. However, while I think that the existing terminological ambiguities cannot be resolved on a general level, I propose that additional clarity can be achieved, as far as the study of Christians is concerned, if one moves, first, away from the problem of 'the faith, spirituality, and religion at work terminology' and addresses the meaning of the term *Christians*. By clarifying the term Christian/s, one can then, I suggest, return to the three terms of faith, spirituality, and religion, and sketch, if not a general understanding of these terms, an understanding of these terms *in the context of* the study of Christians at work (see chapter 7). In the following chapter, I will take a first step in this direction and explore the relationship of fsw research to the study of Christians at work.